

Chapter 3

Śaiva Cremation in Early Saiddhāntika Ritual Manuals

1. Introduction

The earliest major Saiddhāntika ritual manuals (*paddhati*) that are still extant were composed from the tenth century onwards. Seven in number, they comprise the manual of Brahmaśambhu, sometimes referred to as the *Brahmaśambhupaddhati* (BrP) (completed in 937/8 CE), consisting of the *Nityakriyānusandhāna* (exposition of rites for regular worship) and the *Naimittikakriyānusandhāna* (NaiKri) (exposition of occasional rituals);¹ the *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* (SiSārP) by King Bhojadeva (r. 1018 to 1060);² the *Somaśambhupaddhati* (SP) (or *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī*) of Somaśambhu (composed in 1048 CE);³ the *Naṭarājapaddhati* (NaṭP) of Rāmanātha (composed in 1058 CE);⁴ the *Jñānaratnāvalī* (JR) of Jñānaśiva (second half of the 12th century);⁵ and the *Kriyākramadyotikā* (KKD) of Aghoraśiva (1157/8).⁶ With the exception of the SiSārP, all contain instructions for funerary procedures. From the time of the early scriptures to this period between the tenth and twelfth century, we find that in Śaiva religious history, various groups of the Śaiva Siddhānta branch became institutionalized in monasteries (*maṭha*), often sponsored by kings, and they continued to be increasingly involved in public life.⁷ Some of the surviving ritual manuals

¹ See Sanderson 2014, pp. 20–21, especially fn. 74.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 20–21.

³ See Sanderson 2011, p. 5, for a discussion on this dating. Here evidence is presented for an earlier date of composition than previously suggested, e.g. by Brunner-Lachaux 1977 and Sanderson 2007a, p. 420, fn. 640, which offer the possible later dates of 1073/4 CE and 1096/7 CE, respectively.

⁴ Goodall 2014, p. 178.

⁵ For the date of Jñānaśiva, see Goodall 2000, pp. 209–211; Sanderson 2003/2004, p. 358, esp. fn. 24; and Sanderson 2014, p. 23, fn. 80.

⁶ See Goodall 1998, pp. xiii–xvii, fn. 24; and Sanderson 2014, pp. 22–23, fn. 79.

⁷ See Sanderson 2009, pp. 263–273 and Sears 2014, in particular for the foundation and spread of the Saiddhāntika Mattamayūra. The increasing public role of Śaivism is reflected

are the product of monastic networks, through which these standardizing works were often disseminated.⁸ Some of the authors, such as Brahmaśambhu and Somaśambhu, were themselves part of monastic teaching lineages, with Somaśambhu even the abbot of a monastic institution.⁹

It seems that by the time the first of these manuals were composed, funerary rituals and rites of post-mortem ancestor worship had become a standard component of the Śaiva tantric ritual repertoire. Compared to most of the early scriptural material, in the manuals there is also an increase in the variety of funerary practices, including procedures for deaths occurring under special circumstances, such as violent deaths or dying abroad. However, all of the manuals present the initiatory cremation as the default, other procedures being variations thereof.

In terms of their social scope, the instructions envisage a broad clientele base that explicitly includes ascetic communities as well as initiated members of the brahmanical householder mainstream. However, with this increasing involvement in society at large, the diversity of practitioners grew, resulting in the emergence of various initiatory levels as well as communities of lay devotees linked to monastic institutions. These factors strained the doctrinal logic and appropriate application of Śaiva death rites. The basic system of ranks within the initiatory community developed rather early within tantric circles, with the first extant example being the SvāSS, as was discussed in chapter 2.¹⁰ In ascending order, these ranks are the *samayin*, *putraka*, *sādhaka* and *ācārya*. As for the corresponding structure of initiation and consecration rites, this goes as follows: any candidate had first to undergo the preliminary initiation called *samayadīkṣā*, which gives

in the ritual repertoire, whereby the manuals include instructions for royal rituals, such as consecration and apotropaic rituals (see, e.g. Sanderson 2003/2004), as well as for public events such as festivals (see, e.g., Goodall [forthcoming]) and consecration rituals for a variety of religious objects.

⁸ For instance, on the teaching lineages and monastic institution involved in the links between the authors Aghoraśiva and Jñānaśiva, see Goodall 2001; between Somaśambhu and Rāmanātha, see Goodall 2014.

⁹ For Brahmaśambhu belonging to the Mattamayūra lineage, see Sanderson 2014, pp. 21–22, fn. 74, which contains the text and translation of the colophon of the NaiKri, where it is stated that Brahmaśambhu was a disciple of the abbot of Mattamayūra. For Somaśambhu being the head of the Golaḡimāṭha, see Sanderson 2003/2004, p. 442.

¹⁰ See pp. 51ff.

him the status of *samayin*, or neophyte. Only by going through this rite does he become qualified to receive either the ultimate liberation ritual (*nirvāṇadīkṣā*) – which raises him to the status of the *putraka* and thence, if he is chosen, to receive consecration (*abhiṣeka*) to become an *ācārya* – or initiation and consecration as a *sādhaka*, who specializes in attaining supernatural effects. However, in due time, sub-divisions were added to this structure, presumably to accommodate even more differentiated levels of practice. At least from the time of Somaśambhu onwards (mid-11th century), the initiatory levels were divided further, with the *samayadīkṣā* split into a *sāmānyasamayadīkṣā*, the “ordinary *samayadīkṣā*”, and a *viśeṣasamayadīkṣā*, the “special *samayadīkṣā*”, two levels leading to the *nirvāṇadīkṣā*.¹¹ In light of this complex initiatory system and its various spiritual levels, the default of the initiatory cremation is problematic, since according to this rite’s ritual logic, beneficiaries realize ultimate liberation at death. This liberation is ensured and enacted for them by the funerary priest. Theoretically, this limits the ritual’s application to those who have received the *nirvāṇadīkṣā*. Those who have undergone lower level initiations have not yet been promised liberation at death; theoretically they are waiting at some semi-liberated level for their final liberation. This makes them unsuitable for the liberating funerary initiation ritual, especially if following orthodox Saiddhāntika doctrine, which categorically prohibits

¹¹ In her introduction to the third volume of the SP, Brunner-Lachaux (1977, pp. xxx–xxxiii) has discussed this phenomenon, concluding that the division of initiation rites into a tripartite model was a gradual development: no rites were added, but the procedures originally constituting a single initiation rite were first split into two separate initiations – the *samayadīkṣā* and the *nirvāṇadīkṣā* – and then divided further into the three parts taught here. When this last division was made, the middle step, the *viśeṣadīkṣā*, was made up of the rites at the end of the *samayadīkṣā* as well as the preliminary rites of the *nirvāṇadīkṣā*, notably those associated with the birth of the candidate’s soul in the womb of Vāgīśvarī. She points out, however, that this division differs between the sources, causing much confusion concerning the candidate’s status and ritual rights. Earlier sources, using the two-part model, made a clear distinction between the *samayin*, who has received the *samayadīkṣā* and is entitled to live with the guru and study the scriptures, and the *putraka*, who has received the *nirvāṇadīkṣā* and is entitled to perform Śiva worship. But subsequent sources using the tripartite model introduce confusion to the *putraka* level. Of these, some sources, in addition to denoting full initiates, use this assignation for those who have undergone *viśeṣadīkṣā*, where it is also claimed that they are entitled to perform full Śiva worship. See also *s.v. putraka* in TAK 3.

initiation for the uninitiated after death.¹² As in the scriptural sources, however, this complex issue of synthesizing doctrinal matters with the logistics of the newly emerging initiatory structures was not consistently resolved. As there, discrepancies remain between doctrine and practice. The manuals have different ways of acknowledging this issue.

A few words are needed regarding general principles in the composition of Saiddhāntika ritual manuals. The *paddhatis* are conceived as being based on the tradition's scriptural sources. They are not meant to lay out new rites, but rather attempt to present what the scriptures intended in a more understandable form. As such, they are intended to guide officiants through the maze of instructions in the scriptures, where information on how to perform rites is scattered over different chapters. For example, while a scripture chapter on *dīkṣā* contains the rites specific to initiation, it does not contain details about the regular worship during the procedure; these are outlined in a separate chapter. Also the mantras used during rites are not spelled out explicitly, but are only referred to by their names; thus a chapter dedicated to setting out mantras (the *mantroddhāra*) must be consulted. To provide a guide, the manuals draw this material together, supposedly on the basis of a single scripture. As Sanderson describes this:

[...] a Paddhati, literally 'a pathway', being a practical manual that guides the performer of a ritual by co-ordinating the mantras and actions taught explicitly or implicitly in the various parts of a single scripture, setting them out explicitly in the order of their performance and utterance, supplementing them from related scriptures only where the silence of the primary source requires it.¹³

Amongst his many observations on Śaiva tantric ritual systems, Sanderson has made two important discoveries regarding the composition of these manuals.¹⁴ First, he has identified the *Dviśatikālottara* (DviK) (the *Kālot-tara* in its 200-verse redaction) as the root scripture upon which all the extant Saiddhāntika manuals apart from the *Mṛgendrapaddhati* are based. He

¹² See p. 63 and p. 69.

¹³ Sanderson 2003/2004, p. 356.

¹⁴ See Sanderson 2003/2004, pp. 253–361.

argues that the reason for this is the DvīK's simple mantra system and the work's extreme brevity. The former enabled the propagators of the Saiddhāntika tradition to create a ritual system based on a straightforward arrangement of mantras and deities, an arrangement that could be disseminated more easily, thereby imposing ritual uniformity across a wide area. Further, the brevity of the DvīK was advantageous because it consequently contains only a few specific ritual instructions. As pointed out by Sanderson in the above quotation, a basic principle was that instructions could be supplemented with information from other scriptures if the root text had none of its own on a subject. Hence, the redactors of a manual were free to import material from other sources as they judged necessary. In this procedure, for sources a redactor could only use scriptures from a shared corpus, a *sāmānyatantra* ("common scripture"), meaning that the scriptures had to stem from the same tradition.

This leads to Sanderson's second finding, namely that this principle was often tacitly violated. A major influence on the Saiddhāntika ritual repertoire actually goes back to the non-Saiddhāntika scripture *Svacchandatantra* (SvT).¹⁵ This scripture was used extensively by King Bhojadeva of Dhāra to compose his manual, the SiSārP. He relied on the SvT for a number of important sections – including that on initiation. The SvT's influence continued to be felt in subsequent Saiddhāntika manuals, starting with the SP, which is largely a verse redaction of the prose of the SiSārP,¹⁶ and then in the KKD and JR, which, in turn, drew on the SP.

However, there are no sections on funerary practices and ancestor worship in the SvT. Within this sphere of rituals, while the manuals do show a few signs of common sources and points of transmission, there is greater variation in the models that were adopted. It also seems that the authors followed different strategies. The last section of this chapter will consider what this might imply regarding the actual performance of these rites, as well as the extent to which this is reflected in these manuals.

The order of the following descriptions of the early Saiddhāntika ritual manuals is based on their relative chronology.

¹⁵ As has been demonstrated by Sanderson. Cf. Sanderson 2003/2004, pp. 359–369.

¹⁶ Sanderson 2003/2004, pp. 359–360.

2. Brahmaśambhu's *Naimittikakriyānusandhāna*

The earliest extant Saiddhāntika ritual manual is that of Brahmaśambhu, composed in the tenth century. It consists of the *Nityakriyānusandhāna*¹⁷ and the *Naimittikakriyānusandhāna* (NaiKri), the latter of which was composed in 937/8 CE¹⁸ and includes the rites relating to death and post-mortem ancestor worship. This part has survived in a single damaged Nepalese manuscript preserved at the Asiatic Society of Kolkata.¹⁹ The text is hitherto unedited and the available microfilm and scans are of poor quality. Especially towards the end of the manuscript, where the *antyeṣṭi* and *śrāddha* sections are found, folios are missing, are in the wrong order, or show incorrect numbering.²⁰ I have been able to identify nine folios belonging to the chapter on funeral rites.²¹ These are located at the end of the NaiKri's fifth and last section (*paricheda*), which, in turn, consists of the following

¹⁷ There is no complete manuscript of the *Nityakriyānusandhāna*; however, Sanderson notes that a substantial part of it is preserved in a single manuscript of the Kesar Library (see Sanderson 2014, pp. 22–21, fn. 74).

¹⁸ Sanderson 2014, pp. 20–21.

¹⁹ I am grateful to Dominic Goodall, who kindly made his scans of this manuscript available to me. My gratitude also goes to Alexis Sanderson, who shared his transcript of part of the manuscript with me, including a partial transcript of folios 85 and 92.

²⁰ It seems that various attempts have been made over the years to order and number the manuscript: 1) a set of numbering in Nepālākṣara is found on the left of each folio's verso; 2) some folios show traces of an earlier number on the left side of the recto; 3) Roman numbers in pencil are found in the middle of each verso; 4) on some folios, there are traces of erased Roman numbers in pencil in the middle of the verso; 5) on critical folios, which seem to have been mixed up several times, small Nepālākṣara numbering in ink is found on the right lower corner of some verso folios. On the black-and-white microfilm of the manuscript, the first set of Roman pencilled numerals are visible; these have been erased at the time the colour scans were produced. Thus it seems that a curator tried to re-order and number the folios before taking the colour scans (some folios have also been turned around in places where the microfilm shows an incorrect recto-verso order). Whoever re-numbered the manuscripts in Roman numerals apparently did not take note of the small Nepālākṣara numbers on the right lower corners, which are found on both the microfilm and the scans. This must have been an earlier attempt to re-order the folios that have incorrect Nepālākṣara numbering on the left side of the versos. Unfortunately, the relevant folios for death rites are badly mixed up and confused in their numbering.

²¹ Listed according to the Nepālākṣara numbering found on the left side of the verso (seemingly the oldest numbers), these are: folios 82–84; folio 85 (which has been mistakenly numbered folio 86 in the Roman numbering in pencil); folio 86 (in the Roman numbering, mistakenly 88); folio 87; folio 88 (in the Roman numbering, mistakenly 85); folio 89; folio 90; and folio 92. Folio 91 and the remaining folios of this chapter are missing.

sub-sections: (1) the veneration of the deity of the observance (*vrateśvareṣṭi*), (2) the ritual for removing prior sectarian marks before converting to Śaivism (*uddhāro liṅginām*), (3) the initiation of a deceased person (*vyasudīkṣaṇa*), (4) funeral rites (*virāmeṣṭi*) and procedures for post-mortem ancestral offerings (*śrāddha*).²² Since a complete critical edition of the text is planned,²³ here I will only present the points relevant for contextualizing the NaiKri's material on funerary rites within these rites' historical development. Aside from its evidence as the earliest extant Saiddhāntika manual, the work also appears to have been an important source for Jñānaśiva, who draws heavily on it in his chapter on funerary rites, although he does not acknowledge the name of his source.²⁴

2.1. Cremation rituals according to Brahmaśambhu

The opening verses to the *antyeṣṭi* procedures are quite revealing regarding common perceptions of Śaiva funerary rituals present at the time of Brahmaśambhu:

[Some may say that] there is no difference between [the Śaiva *antyeṣṭi*] and [ordinary] *antyeṣṭi*. One who knows (*tadvidā*) should answer “no”, since that [Śaiva cremation] is the forest fire that removes obstacles for [the group of initiates] starting with the *putraka*. Death [takes place] through the cessation of experiences of the experiencer, [and is] the final separation (*atyantaṃ viyogo*) from [all that needs] to be experienced together with the means of the experiencing.²⁵

²² BrP NaiKri, fol. 103r, lines 2–3: *vrateśvareṣṭir uddhāro liṅginām vyasudīkṣaṇam | virāmeṣṭis tato py ante śrāddhakalpaś ca pañcamaḥ || ity arthā pañcame py asyā paricchede nirūpitāḥ | dīkṣākarmānusandhānapaddhater brahmaśambhunā ||*.

²³ A collaborative editing project is currently underway, directed by Dominic Goodall.

²⁴ See p. 103 for a table of parallels in the JR, including its references to the BrP. Further, other South Indian Saiddhāntika authors frequently quote Brahmaśambhu's manual, including Aghoraśiva (also in his commentary on the *Mrgendra*), Trilocana, Varuṇaśivācārya (*Varuṇapaddhati*), and Vaktraśambhu (*Mrgendrapaddhativyākhyā*).

²⁵ NaiKri folio 85v1–2 (corresponding to JR AP 83–84): *anteṣṭer na viśeṣo syād vaktavyaṃ neti tadvidā | sā yataḥ putrakādīnām antarāyadavānalaḥ || bhogāyatanapānto bhoktur bhogakṣayānvite | bhoktavyānām sahātyantaṃ viyogo bhogasādhanaiḥ ||*.

With this, Brahmaśambhu counteracts possible criticism, namely, that the function fulfilled by the Śaiva cremation is not different than the brahmanical one. This touches on the fundamental inconsistencies and problems of Śaiva cremation, as described above. Conformity with the doctrinal justifications found in the early scriptural sources, Brahmaśambhu also stresses that through Śaiva cremation, obstacles that might impede an initiate's path to liberation in the last moments of his life are thus removed, alluding to the concept that the cremation is a kind of purificatory ritual.²⁶

This is followed by a list of the categories of death – from the inauspicious to the auspicious, with the most elevated category being death by yogic suicide (*utkrānti*). It is also specified that the cremation ritual for a person who has died by *utkrānti* should be performed without the purification of the path, that is to say, without the funerary initiation, since through the *utkrānti* procedure, an initiated yogic practitioner (the *yogin*) is considered to have already enacted union with Śiva at the moment of death.²⁷

As for the funeral rite itself, the procedure is very close to that of the other manuals that will be outlined in detail below, in particular that of Jñānaśiva, who may well have modelled his prescriptions on Brahmaśambhu's work.²⁸ Since the procedures are very similar, and with part of the text of this section missing, the procedure as prescribed by Brahmaśambhu will not be outlined separately here. However, one part of these funeral procedures is unique to this text, namely, the description of funerary practices in the case of death within a monastic institution (*maṭha*), a passage fortunately preserved in a single folio. It will be discussed below in section 2.2.3.

²⁶ As shown below (see p. 103), this is part of the passage that seems tacitly to have been incorporated into Jñānaśiva's manual; the new context renders the interpretation of the verses difficult. Jñānaśiva or later redactors also added some *pādas* that make the text even more difficult to interpret there.

²⁷ NaiKri folios 85v2–5 and 88r1. For the text, cf. JR AP 85–90b, which quotes this passage. For *utkrānti* and its procedure, cf. pp. 57ff., particularly fn. 54.

²⁸ Cf. fn. 26.

2.2. Posthumous initiation of a deceased *samayin*

In his manual, Brahmaśambhu includes the possibility of posthumous initiation for a *samayin*, similar to what we have seen in the SJU. In fact, just as in the SJU, Brahmaśambhu offers this procedure on its own terms as a special variety of initiation, not as one of various types of possible cremation rituals.²⁹ The procedure itself, too, is very similar to that found in the SJU, involving the preparation of a puppet made of *kuśa* grass, flour paste or cow-dung and soaked in *pañcagavya*, a mixture of the five products of the cow, namely, a combination of milk, sour milk, butter, as well as liquid and solid excreta. The soul is then caught using the Great-Net mantra and placed in the puppet. After this, the guru performs the initiation for the deceased person's soul, which in the end is united with Śiva. When this procedure has been completed, the puppet is burnt. This is followed by *śrāddha* rituals in the deceased person's name.³⁰

2.3. Funerary practices for those who die in the *maṭha*

An exceptional feature of the NaiKri is the deeper insight it gives us into actual procedures within monastic institutions. This appears to have been a major topic for Brahmaśambhu.³¹ While the existence of monastic institutions can be inferred in other sources, they do not explicitly discuss any practical or logistical matters specific to this context. Brahmaśambhu, however, specifies that if a close relative has died within a monastic complex, all of the funerary rituals should be performed just as outlined in the earlier

²⁹ Note that in later manuals, such as those of Jñānaśiva and Aghoraśiva, which include this option as well, it is found as an additional type of cremation, next to rites for those who have died inauspicious deaths. See p. 107 and p. 121.

³⁰ BrP NaiKri, folio. 85r1–5 (diplomatic transcription): *pratyakṣam vā parokṣam vā vipannasyādhikāriṇaḥ | yathānukampayā dīkṣāṃ guruḥ kuryāt tathocyate || kli<ṣṭasya> samayasthasya hīnasyottaradīkṣayā | deśāntare vipannasya muktikāmasya deśikaḥ || 40 || + yajñamaṇḍape + (i.m.) kauśiṃ tatpratimāṃ kṛtvā paiṣiṃ vā gomayodbhavāṃ | pañcagavyaplutāṃ tasyān talliṅgam upakalpayet | mahājālaprayogeṇa mantramudrābalānvitāḥ || O || + mṛtasya puryaṣṭaka + (i.m.) + + + + + + + (ill.) jālamudrāvasaṃ + + | mantradehaka-lānyāsaṃ samhṛtyaivaṃ vidhāya ca || viśodhya pūrvavat pāsān yojayed amale pade | payāhsarpimadhuyuktaṃ tadrūpaṃ śivatejasā || dāhayitvā tadarthaṃ ca śrāddhaṃ kuryāt tadātmakam || O ||.*

³¹ The NaiKri also contains sections regarding various practical aspects of monastic institutions, such as the layout of the buildings in monasteries.

section. However, following the funeral the chief mourner is to sponsor a huge feast within the monastery itself. Moreover, on this occasion the guru is to announce that the deceased person's donations will stay within the monastery:

If an initiated ascetic or non-ascetic ritualist who is a close relative has died in the *āśrama*, he should perform the entire [funeral] rite for him in the proper order. [After the funerary procedures,] he should organize a meal for the ascetics in the monastery on behalf of [the deceased]. He should smear the monastery completely with cow-dung on the outside [and] on the inside. He should have the kitchen specially prepared (*viśeṣeṇa...kārayitvā*), with the purification of the cooking pots (*bhāṇḍaśuddhiḥ*)³² by particularly pure and auspicious people who have also taken the purificatory baths. [Further, he should donate] sandalwood [to the monastery] in accordance with his financial means. And for those of a different lineage (*gocara*), it is the same procedure of rites [that is to be performed]. After the meal, the guru [first] speaks to the various groups of ascetics [in the monastery,] starting with the gurus and ending with the *samayins*; then he should speak to the lay devotees (*māheśvaraḥjanān*), the servants, as well as the workers (*dāsān karmakarāṃs tathā*) – all seen one after the other (*dṛṣṭapūrvāparān*) – [as well as to] all the religious people [present] (*sarvān sadharmināḥ*), [saying,] “This chief of wise men who remained here [and] was of X *gocara* has died, †...†. The remainder of whatever [financial] service he has given by his (i.e. the deceased person's) own hand for the purpose of medicine, ascetic equipment (*mātra*), books and goods is passed on to the chief ascetics in the *āśramas* frequented by ascetics.”³³

³² Purificatory rites concerning the buildings of the *maṭha*, as well as the kitchen and its cooking pots indicate that upon the death of an initiate, also the physical space was considered in need of purification. This appears to have been an obligatory service required of the chief mourner.

³³ NaiKri folios 92v2–93r3: *avratasṭho vratasṭho vā kriyāvān dīkṣito yadā || āsannata-rasambandhī svaryātas (i.m.: mṛta) tu yadāśrame | tadā tasya vidhiṃ kṛtsnam nirvartyā + yathākramam || tadarthaṃ bhōjanam kāryam maṭha eva tapasvinām | bahir antar maṭham liptvā gomayena nirantaram || mahānasam viśeṣeṇa bhāṇḍaśuddhiḥ puraḥsaram | kārayitvā ca susnātaiḥ kuśalais tatra candanam || śucibhiḥ ca viśeṣeṇa śaktyā dravyānusārataḥ |*

Several aspects regarding the socio-religious context are notable in this passage. First, we see here that while the author is envisaging the case of a deceased member of the initiatory community within the monastic complex, this person still has relatives obliged to carry out funeral rites for him. We can infer from this that the deceased person is likely to be a novice or another kind of initiate who has moved to the monastery temporarily to study, or someone who has renounced his worldly status in old age and moved to the *āśrama*, similar to the last stage of the brahmanical *varṇāśramadharmā* system. In this scenario, it seems that the responsibility for carrying out funeral rites still lies with the deceased person's family, who are also required to organize the large feast in the *maṭha* itself. At the end of this meal, the guru confirms that whatever donation was given to the monastery by the deceased is to stay within the monastic institution. This suggests that in such cases there were occasionally disputes over inheritance designated for the monastic institution.³⁴ Following this passage, there are still more instructions regarding inheritance within the monastic order. These dictate that in the case of the death of a disciple, his belongings are to go to his guru, a co-disciple or his lineage. It seems that here, this type of disciple is distinguished from the above case, perhaps implying that these instructions are for younger disciples – equivalent to the brahmanical *brahmacārya* – who do not yet have many belongings or a household.³⁵

atulyagocarāṇām tu tulya eva kriyākramah || tadarthaṃ kiṃ tu tat kāryam (em. Sanderson; kārye Cod.) tattadgocarapūrvakam | bhojanottarakālam tu vivikte sthānake guruḥ || deśikādisamayantān vyāhṛtya tu tapodhanān | māheśvarajanāṃś (corr. Sanderson; māheśvaram janāṃś Cod.) cāpi dāsān karmakarāṃś tathā || dṛṣṭapūrvāparān brūyād iti sarvān sadharmināḥ | munīndro yaṃ śivībhūtaḥ sthito 'trāmukagocarah || ṣanvaye vāmukasyoccaiḥ prashṭite mukanāmataḥṣ | iyan tasya svahastena dattaśeṣāvatiṣṭhate || mātreṣṭapustikādravya-m-auśadhārtham upakriyā | seviteṣu munīndrāṇām āśrameṣu tapasvibhiḥ ||.

³⁴ That the property of monastic community members generally needed careful regulation can also be seen in the Buddhist *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya*, where it is specified that a monk can have property and that upon his death it must remain within the monastic institution rather than go to the king. See, e.g., Sanderson 2009, pp. 102–103, particularly fn. 215 and Schopen 2004, pp. 91–121.

³⁵ This passage has also been incorporated into the JR and will be discussed again in chapter 4.

Secondly, this passage gives us some insight into the structure of communities associated with *maṭhas*. Not only are the various levels of initiates present at the meal and during announcement of the initiate's death, but also servants and workers, as well as a community of lay devotees. The explicit mention of lay devotees in this context implies the close connection monastic institutions had with surrounding lay populations.

3. The *Somaśambhupaddhati*

The *Somaśambhupaddhati* (SP), also referred to as the *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī*, was composed sometime in the second half of the eleventh century, most probably in 1073 CE.³⁶ It received a commentary by Trilocana.³⁷ As mentioned above, Sanderson has demonstrated that much of the SP is based on the ritual system taught in the non-Saiddhāntika scripture SvT; the former is heavily dependent on the SiSārP by King Bhojadeva, and much of his work, in turn, is a prose version of parts of the SvT.

The SP was an extremely influential work in the Siddhānta. For example, it was the principal source for authors such as Jñānaśiva and Aghoraśiva, who produced authoritative manuals that would become widely used in South India.³⁸ Evidence of its influence is also its unacknowledged incorporation into the *Agnipurāṇa*, where it is passed off as scripture, as well as the survival of a substantial number of manuscripts of the text in widely separated regions of the subcontinent, including Kashmir, the far southern parts of India, and Nepal.³⁹ In comparison, the only known copy of Brahmaśambhu's manual is a single Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript. Further, Brunner-Lachaux has shown that much of the SP was incorporated into late South Indian Saiddhāntika scriptures such as the *Uttarakāmika* and *Cintya-viśvasādākhya*.⁴⁰ It thus constitutes an important point of reference for the formation of the South Indian Śaiva ritual repertoire.

³⁶ The date has been discussed extensively in Sanderson 2007, pp. 420–421, in particular in fn. 640.

³⁷ Goodall (2000, pp. 209–210 [fn. 15, 17 and 18] and p. 219) has demonstrated that Trilocana, the commentator on the SP, was a disciple of both Jñānaśiva and Aghoraśiva.

³⁸ See Sanderson 2003/2004, p. 360 and Brunner-Lachaux 1998, p. xlix.

³⁹ Sanderson 2009, p. 23, fn. 73.

⁴⁰ Brunner-Lachaux 1998, pp. lvii–lix.

A factor in its success may have been the author, Somaśambhu, being part of a powerful and influential monastic network, holding the position of pontiff of the Golagīmaṭha,⁴¹ a monastery prominent in the history of the Siddhānta. It was allegedly founded by the Kalacuri king Yuvarājadeva,⁴² who reigned probably in the tenth century.⁴³ In an inscription in the district of Malkapuram, Somaśambhu's name is found in a teaching lineage where he is described as the abbot of the Golagīmaṭha and the author of a ritual manual bearing his name.⁴⁴ There are a number of signs that his work circulated widely through these monastic networks. For example, the South Indian author Rāmanātha, a contemporary of Somaśambhu, drew heavily on the latter's work when composing his own manual, as will be discussed below.

Another point that may have destined Somaśambhu's manual to be transmitted and become a standard authority for the Śaiva ritual repertoire is its relative brevity. Especially in the section on funerary rituals, the instructions are quite sparse. For example, the passage on collecting the bones after the cremation consists only of two verses. The work's success thus may lie in the fact that it provided a normative framework into which local practices could be easily accommodated and adapted.

3.1. Initiatory cremation as a privilege of full initiates

In striking contrast to all the other manuals, the SP presents only the initiatory cremation – from the funeral procession to the gathering of the bones. It also gives the restriction that this type of cremation is to be performed only for an *ācārya*, a *sādhaka* or a *putraka*. For anyone else, a Śaiva cremation is to be performed without the initiation of the deceased.

⁴¹ See Sanderson 2009, p. 23. SP 245: *golakyām ādhipatyena tiṣṭhatā somaśambhunā | kriyākāṇḍakramāvalyām dikṣā nirvānadoditā*. “In [this] *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* [I.] Somaśambhu, while holding office as the abbot of the Golakī[maṭha], have now explained the initiation that bestows liberation.” The reading Golagī- rather than Golakī- follows Sanderson 2009, p. 209, where the common Golakī- is corrected to the reading Golagī- on the basis of this spelling being found in the earliest Nepalese manuscripts. Information about this monastery's history is found in Sanderson 2009, pp. 209–211.

⁴² Ghose 1996, p. 164.

⁴³ See Brunner-Lachaux 1998, p. xlv and Sanderson 2009, pp. 209–211.

⁴⁴ See Brunner-Lachaux 1998, p. xliii.

The funeral ritual is taught for someone who is a *sādhaka*, an *ācārya* or a *putraka*⁴⁵ and dies for some reason or other, but for anyone else [the funeral ritual] is without the purification of the *tattvas*.⁴⁶

The logic behind this, it appears, is that a person qualifies for receiving initiatory cremation only if he has already been granted liberation at death by having received the *nirvāṇadīkṣā*, which is what these categories of initiates have in common. Excluded are therefore the *samayins*, or neophytes, who have received only the *samayadīkṣā* and are on an inferior level of the path to ultimate liberation. This makes the initiatory cremation in this work a special rite reserved for upper levels of initiates. Perhaps in accordance with this implied exclusive character, it is noticeable that Somaśambhu's prescription does not acknowledge the doctrinal notion of Śaiva cremation having an expiatory function, as found in other texts as an attempt to justify its performance. In his commentary, Trilocana modifies this by adding here that a simple cremation without the purification of the path – for Somaśambhu, only for the *samayin* – is to be performed for any initiate who has not transgressed the post-initiatory discipline, thereby acknowledging both the purificatory function of initiatory cremation and the implied notion that a simple cremation for the spiritually more elevated is even more prestigious.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ The order *sādhaka*, *ācārya* and *putraka* in the text is due to metrical reasons.

⁴⁶ SP 10.1: *sādhakācāryaputrāṇām mṛtasyaikasya karhicit | antyeṣṭir ucyate 'nyasya hy adhvāśuddhivivarjitā ||*. Note that this reading is also supported by the *Uttarakāmika* (27.3), which may have been composed with Somaśambhu in mind (see Brunner-Lachaux 1977, p. 569, 1a): *ācāryādītrayāṇām syāt tattvaśuddhisamanvitā | antyeṣṭir itareṣām ca tattvaśuddhivivarjitā*, “The funeral ritual should be performed with the purification of the *tattvas* for the group of three starting with the *ācārya* (i.e. *ācāryas*, *sādhakas*, and *putrakas*), and without the purification of *tattvas* for other people.”

⁴⁷ See Trilocana's commentary on the term *anyasya* in SP 10.1 (cited from Brunner-Lachaux 1977, p. 569): *atha anyasya; atrānyaśabdena samayalaṅghanaparād anyah samayaparipālakaś ca sādhakādītrayād anyah samayī ca grhyate. evaṃ *dvaividhyasya* (em. Brunner-Lachaux; *traividhyasya* Cod.) *tattvaśuddhivivarjitā śivāgnimātram evety arthaḥ*. In order to support his interpretation, Trilocana even quotes SārK 26.6–8ab, the passage stating that cremation has a purificatory function to counteract transgressions committed during one's post-initiatory practice. This passage is also used by Jñānaśiva, one of Trilocana's gurus, in his JR.

3.3. The scope of Somaśambhu's *antyeṣṭi*

Concerning practical application, the text gives little concrete information about the potential beneficiaries. The only explicit term used to refer to the recipient of Śaiva cremation is *tapasvin* ("ascetic"), in SP 10.38ab (*tatra devārcaṇam kuryāt tam uddiśya tapasvinam*). Brunner-Lachaux claims that this should be understood by extension as referring to all Śaiva initiates, not only to ascetics.⁴⁸ However, this remains speculative since she provides no evidence to support her claim. Indeed, it should be noted that Somaśambhu himself makes no explicit statement that he considers these procedures appropriate for a householder. It is conceivable that Somaśambhu, being himself an ascetic, the head of a *maṭha*, and representing the tradition of an ascetic community, envisaged his instructions only in this context.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, since initiatory cremation was by this time widely and increasingly associated with the cremation of householders, and since the next chapter of the SP contains an exposition on the rites of post-mortem ancestor worship, rites strongly connected to the religious observances of brahmanical householders, it seems likely that Brunner-Lachaux's intuition was correct and that Somaśambhu's instructions were also to be applied outside the monastic context.

Although the SP was an influential work and its instructions passed on to later works, it is questionable whether the manual itself was actually used widely to guide cremation procedures. It may rather have represented an authoritative template that was superimposed on local practices. This would explain some notable omissions. For instance, it is puzzling that the SP, unlike the *NaiKri*,⁵⁰ JR and KKD, does not contain instructions for any additional categories of death, such as those occurring under inauspicious circumstances. If the manual was indeed used widely as a guide, it would have needed to include also such topics. Aware of this deficiency, Trilocana apparently attempts to remedy this point in his commentary and includes

⁴⁸ Brunner-Lachaux 1977, p. 612, fn. 94.

⁴⁹ For example, the bier on which the corpse is carried in a procession to the cremation ground is referred to as *vimāna*, a term designating extremely elaborate and expensive biers as used for dignitaries such as the head of a *maṭha*. Cf. p. 135.

⁵⁰ In the *NaiKri* there was only a procedure for *samayins* who have died out of sight; however, it may well be that more sections on inauspicious deaths were also included here in the chapter on funerary practices, but are unavailable due to the loss of folios.

people who have died under inauspicious circumstances in his list of those eligible for an initiatory cremation:

The funeral rite with the purification of the *tattvas* is to be performed for an *ācārya*, *sādhaka*, or *putraka* who was devoid of proper conduct and carried out forbidden practices, [or] **who died at some point for some reason such as disease, weapons or water.**⁵¹

This statement is rather surprising, given that inauspicious deaths (*dur-marāṇa*) – which classically include those by weapons, disease or drowning, as mentioned here – are treated in Indian literature as a separate and dangerous category to be handled with particular care and usually requiring some additional purificatory and apotropaic rites, such as the *nārāyaṇabali*. It is therefore unusual that such deaths are mentioned alongside those of deceased persons whose defect was ritual transgression during their lifetime, and that both categories are entitled to receive the same Śaiva initiatory cremation.

4. The *Naṭarājapaddhati*

The South Indian ritual manual *Naṭarājapaddhati* (NaṭP) was composed by an otherwise unknown person named Rāmanātha in 1058 CE and is preserved in a single paper manuscript.⁵² Rāmanātha's work relies heavily on that of Somaśambhu, with entire passages nearly parallel.⁵³ That the NaṭP's date of composition predates that of the SP (1073 CE) seems to contradict this direction of influence, but Goodall has pointed out that Rāmanātha himself acknowledges Somaśambhu's work as a source. Given the clear chronology, Goodall has hypothesized that Rāmanātha either had access to an earlier version of the SP or to textual material that ended up forming

⁵¹ Trilocana *ad* SP 1.1 (Sanskrit text quoted from Brunner-Lachaux 1991, p. 569 [1b]): *ācāryasādhakaputrāṇām* (em.; *ācāryaḥ sādhaḥaḥ putrāṇām* Ed.) *madhye yaḥ kaś cid uktācārahito niṣiddhācārapālakas tasya karhi cit kenāpi prakāreṇa rogaśastrasālilādīnā mṛtasyaikasyāntyeṣṭis tattvaviśodhīnī kāryā.*

⁵² Discovered in a Śaiva monastery at Tiruvāvaṭuturai, near Kumbhakona, Tamil Nadu, by Goodall (2014). I am very grateful to him for sharing the manuscript and etext with me.

⁵³ See Goodall 2014, in particular p. 178.

substantial parts of that work. In this situation, the NaṭP offers a source for gaining insight into the process of textual production and the ritual variations that led to the widely transmitted version of the SP. In general, Rāmanātha's manual often lacks the elegance and clarity of the SP, as has been noted by Goodall.⁵⁴ This is particularly the case for the chapters on *antyeṣṭi* and *śrāddha*.⁵⁵

Thematically, Rāmanātha places funerary and *śrāddha* rituals in a different context than Somaśambhu does. The latter describes cremation and *śrāddha* rituals as separate cycles and gives them distinct sections following a passage on removing earlier sectarian marks (*liṅgoddhāra*). In contrast, Rāmanātha positions funerary procedures and the *śrāddha* rituals in the chapter on initiation (*dīkṣā*). With this arrangement, he signals that he considers these ritual cycles part of the soteriological path commenced with the *dīkṣā* ritual, thus touching on the ambiguous position these post-mortem rites hold within the Śaiva ritual world.

Again when compared to Somaśambhu's work, Rāmanātha's descriptions are longer and more detailed. For instance, the procedures for funerary initiation are expounded upon by Rāmanātha in 33 and a quarter verses (NaṭP 11.247c–280c) whereas Somaśambhu covers this point briefly in a mere 9 and a quarter verses (SP AP 22–31a). Overall, Rāmanātha's work provides a more complete set of instructions for the funerary priest. Significantly, it spells out for the officiant the moment in the rite where the procedure for lower-level initiates differs from that of higher-level initiates, namely before the funerary initiation would take place: just as for the *putraka*, the soul of a *samayin* or a *viśeṣasamayin* is to be caught with the Great-Net mantra (*mahājālantra*) and placed in the corpse prepared with mantras, but instead of receiving the funerary initiation at this point, the soul of lower-level initiates is united here with Śiva at a lower level, namely that of Rudra's world (i.e. the *rudrapada*) rather than at the higher level of Īśvara's world (*īśvarapada*) designated for full initiates. In contrast, Somaśambhu only specifies that the Śaiva cremation for a *samayin* is performed without the purification of the path, but does not provide practical details for the officiant on how this type of cremation is to be performed.

⁵⁴ Goodall 2014, p. 174.

⁵⁵ On *śrāddha*, see chapter 5.

Rather, instructions for guiding a *samayin*'s soul to Rudra's world are found in the later manual of Aghoraśiva, which will be discussed in section 6.

5. The *Jñānaratnāvalī*

The precise date of composition of the *Jñānaratnāvalī* (JR) is unknown. From evidence drawn together by Goodall and Sanderson, it seems that its author, Jñānaśiva (also referred to as Jñānaśambhu in some places), wrote the text while dwelling in Benares, although he came from South India since he describes himself as a native of the country of the Colas (*coladeśa*) and a devotee of the Lord of the Little Hall (*dabhrasabhāpatih*), that is, the Śiva Naṭarāja of Cidambaram.⁵⁶ He was a contemporary of Aghoraśiva, who was himself active in Cidambaram and composed his own ritual manual in 1157/8. This places Jñānaśiva sometime in the second half of the twelfth century.⁵⁷ Both authors inherited the ritual tradition of Brahmaśambhu and Somaśambhu based on the DviK. In the chapter on cremation rituals, Jñānaśiva's manual seems to use both sources heavily. Two substantial sections are parallel to the BrP's NaiKri, and for his injunctions for initiatory cremation itself, he follows those of the SP closely, often echoing its wording and including the same mantras. However, Jñānaśiva's passage contains more detail;⁵⁸ for instance, what is outlined by Somaśambhu in thirty-nine verses is covered in sixty-three in the JR, the general structure being parallel apart from one exception.⁵⁹ Jñānaśiva also

⁵⁶ The evidence is presented in Goodall 2000, p. 212, fn. 22.

⁵⁷ Goodall 2000, p. 211.

⁵⁸ Given the above evidence of Rāmanātha, who acknowledges Somaśambhu's work as a source for his manual but who may have had access to earlier – and perhaps longer – versions of the SP, we may speculate if decades later Jñānaśiva may also have had access to other similar versions of Somaśambhu's work. In both, Rāmanātha's and Jñānaśiva's case, we might also consider the possibility that the passages that largely parallel the SP but are longer were in fact taken over from such versions.

⁵⁹ The only difference in the ritual sequence here is the timing for preparing the *vāstumāṇḍala*, the drawing at the bottom of the pit for the pyre. The SP enjoins preparing the *vāstumāṇḍala* prior to preparing the ritual site. According to the JR, the *vāstumāṇḍala* should be prepared later, namely after the officiant has ritually purified and prepared the site, himself, the ritual materials and the corpse. However, as will be discussed in chapter 4, it is probable that some tasks relating to preparing the site were taken care of by professionals before the rites began. Thus, if the *vāstumāṇḍala* was prepared by such a specialist, the

quotes scriptural material, namely the SārK and the BK (with a passage originally redacted from the SvāSS).⁶⁰ Both of these are “cognate” scriptures of the DviK, thus in line with the root scripture of the Saiddhāntika manuals.⁶¹ The parallels between the *antyeṣṭi* chapter and earlier sources as well as Aghoraśiva’s KKD are listed in the following table (the numbering of the JR verses follows the edition in appendix A):

JR <i>Antyeṣṭiprakaraṇa</i>	Parallel passages
6–8ab	SārK 26.6cd–8
8cd–9	BK, NGMPP B24/57, f. 214r1–214r2
76–90ab	BrP NaiKri ff. 85r1–88r1
90cd–93	1. KKD T370, pp. 213–214. 2. BrP NaiKri f. 88v2–4 (though the context is a different one from the JR and KKD)
95cd–96ab	KKD T403, p. 178, in a passage allegedly quoted from the BrP (unidentified)
96cd – 99	BrP NaiKri f. 93r4–93v1
96cd–99ab	KKD T403, p. 177.
110cd	BrP NaiKri f. 93v5 SvāSS 22.16ab
101 – 115	BK, NGMPP B24/57, ff. 214r1–215r1 (redacted from SvāSS 22.11–15ab)
116–124	KKD T370, pp. 217–218

5.1. Types of cremation and their beneficiaries

The JR teaches four kinds of Śaiva cremation: (1) initiatory cremation, (2) cremation of an effigy preceded by the initiation of the deceased person’s soul, (3) a simple cremation with the Śiva fire without initiation, and (4) cremation of an effigy followed by rites to rescue the soul of someone who has died under inauspicious circumstances. Of the beneficiaries, some cate-

point at which the preparation is mentioned in the text does not reflect the order in which it actually took place.

⁶⁰ See p. 53, fn. 46.

⁶¹ These verses are interspersed with prose comments added either by Jñānaśiva himself or by later redactors.

gories overlap or contradict each other, probably as a result of the eclectic manner of the work's composition.

Unlike Somaśambhu, who was possibly intentionally more ambiguous on this point, Jñānaśiva's instructions explicitly include both ascetics (*vratin*) and householders (*grhin*) as recipients of Śaiva cremation.⁶² That both groups clearly participate in the ritual is also apparent in the injunctions regulating the purification from impurity caused by death (*śāvāśauca*), where separate rules are discussed for each group.⁶³

5.1.1. Initiatory cremation

Two criteria are used to determine if an initiate should receive an initiatory cremation. The first echoes the view of the SP, namely that initiates who have received *nirvāṇadīkṣā*, that is, *ācāryas*, *sādhakas* and *putrakas*, receive the initiatory cremation; *samayins* receive a simple cremation.⁶⁴ However, unlike Somaśambhu, Jñānaśiva adds that in some cases even *samayins* can receive an initiatory cremation if they had been particularly eager during their lifetime to receive liberation (*mokṣakāṅkṣin*), i.e. the *nirvāṇadīkṣā*, but died before this was possible.⁶⁵ To distinguish this from the first statement, the term *mokṣakāṅkṣin* probably must be understood as referring to exceptional cases, perhaps similar to what was taught in the SJU's *mṛtadīkṣā*:⁶⁶ when the deceased, had he not passed away, would have received the *nirvāṇadīkṣā* without a doubt, such as an extremely devout *samayin* to whom the guru had decided to give *nirvāṇadīkṣā* before the fervent follower died. Doctrinally, giving a funerary initiation in the sense of a proper posthumous initiation to someone who did not receive a *nirvāṇadīkṣā* during his lifetime is of course problematic, as discussed

⁶² JR AP 11: *ācāryaḥ sādhaḥ vāpi putrakaḥ samayī ca vā | vratinaṃ grhiṇaṃ vāpi mṛtaṃ saṃsnāpya bhūṣayet ||*. For the edition and annotated translation, see the appendices.

⁶³ See section starting on p. 161.

⁶⁴ JR AP 10: *sādhakācāryaputrāṇāṃ kuryād adhvaśodhanam | naiva tat samayasthasya kuryād vā mokṣakāṅkṣiṇaḥ ||*. For the edition and annotated translation, see the appendices.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ See pp. 67ff.

above.⁶⁷ But passages such as this one reveal that such practices appear to have remained current in practiced religion.

The second criterion is found in the scriptural passage quoted at the opening of the chapter. Here performing the initiatory cremation is linked not only to the initiatory status of the deceased, but also to his virtue and piousness. It is enjoined that the virtuous are simply burnt with a Śiva fire, but those who have transgressed their post-initiatory disciplines receive the initiatory cremation:

[The officiant] should also burn the corpse with the Śiva fire of those established in [various] realities (*tattvaniṣṭhānām*) as a result of *dīkṣā*, who have observed their post-initiatory discipline at all times, who have been devoted to the teaching of the Siddhānta, and who have died a timely death [with the difference that] for such a person the rituals of offering rice balls and water to the deceased (*piṇḍakriyā* and *udakakriyā*) are prescribed. In the case of those who have deviated from the post-initiatory discipline and certain others, the purification of the path [of the levels of the universe] is [also] prescribed.⁶⁸

This view complies with the sentiment of various scriptural passages presented above in chapter 2, where it is prescribed that Śaiva cremation be performed to counteract the negative consequences of discipline transgressions, offences committed against elders or Śiva himself, doubts concerning the efficacy of Śaiva doctrine, or impurities that have been contracted in other ways. One such source is the SārK, which Jñānaśiva quotes in the verses following the above passage.⁶⁹ The next passage, also a scriptural quotation, expresses similar sentiments, but additionally contains a feature

⁶⁷ As discussed above, this point was also an important topic for the 10th-century commentator Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. See p. 63 and p. 69.

⁶⁸ JR AP 4–5: *dīkṣātas tattvaniṣṭhānām sadācāravatām nṛṇām | siddhāntārthavinodānām kālena vigaṭātmanām || śivāgninā dahed dehaṃ kiṃ tu tasya kriyā matā | anācāravādādinām adhvaśuddhir vidhīyate* ||. For the edition and annotated translation, see the appendices.

⁶⁹ JR AP 6–8ab. For the edition and annotated translation, see the appendices. However, one must keep in mind that the ritual context of the SārK is quite different, being generic in nature: the procedure given there for Śaiva cremation does not include a proper initiation rite, nor is it linked to a specific initiatory status, see pp. 60ff.

that is quite controversial in the light of Saiddhāntika doctrine. In a passage parallel to the BK, it teaches that Śaiva cremation may also be performed for someone who has died after converting from Śaivism to another religion.

At the time of death the funeral rite (i.e. the initiatory cremation) should be performed for those who are not free of doubts [concerning their liberation through initiation], are particularly impure, have converted to another religion, or have neglected their post-initiatory rules. For otherwise [such a person] would not obtain the highest state.⁷⁰

It is not clear whether in this passage we are to understand that someone who “converted to another religion” refers specifically to a convert who had previously received a Śaiva tantric initiation, or whether this category also includes members of brahmanical society who had converted to a non-brahmanical religious tradition and never received initiation. The former appears more likely given the controversial issues we encountered in the Siddhānta regarding procedures that essentially amount to posthumous initiation. At this point we may note that there is one other passage in the JR that may be referring to Śaiva cremation for an uninitiated person, in this case either a relative of a Śaiva initiate, or a follower of the brahmanical religion who is a lay devotee of Śiva.⁷¹ In both cases, however, the close association to the Śaiva religion is obvious, unlike the case of a convert.

⁷⁰ JR AP 8cd–9 (= BK NGMPP B24/57, f. 214r1–214r2): *amuktasamśayānām ca samalānām viśeṣataḥ || sāstrāntaraprapannānām tathā luptakriyeṣu ca | antyeṣṭir hy antataḥ kāryā nānyathā param āpnuyāt ||*. For the edition and annotated translation, see the appendices.

⁷¹ JR AP 82. For the edition and annotated translation, see the appendices.

5.1.2. Cremation of an effigy: *mṛtadīkṣā*

Following the full description of initiatory cremation, the cremation of an effigy representing the deceased person is discussed. This cremation is preceded by the initiation of the deceased person's soul.⁷² This rite is enjoined to be performed if an initiate has died abroad or in a circumstance such as a battle, presumably with the implication that the corpse is not accessible. The passage makes it clear, however, that the rite cannot be used to initiate someone who has abandoned his discipline.

[If] someone has died out of reach or in such situations as in battles, [the officiant] should make an image made out of such materials as *darbha* grass [and] perform the remaining rites just as before. The funeral rite should never be performed for one who has abandoned his discipline.⁷³

The next verses then specify that *samayins* who died before they could receive the *nirvāṇadīkṣā* are also potential beneficiaries of this particular form of initiatory cremation, explicitly enjoining the same procedure for *samayins* who have died abroad.⁷⁴

At the end of this section, the manual adds that this rite should also be performed for a deceased relative who followed the Vaidika tradition (*lokadharmānusārataḥ*):

This is also the procedure for a dead relative who has died nearby and ... [who followed?] the *śivadharmā* [and therefore lived] in accordance with the mundane religion (that is, the brahmanical religion).⁷⁵

⁷² Cf. SJU, chapter 12.

⁷³ JR AP 74c–75: *parokṣe ca mṛtaḥ kaścīd āhavādiṣu vā tadā || darbhādyaiḥ pratimāṃ kṛtvā śeṣaṃ pūrvavad ācaret | naiva bhagnavratasyāśya kāryāntyeṣṭiḥ kadācana ||*. For the edition and annotated translation, see the appendices.

⁷⁴ JR AP 76c–78b: *yathānukampayā dīkṣāṃ guruḥ kuryād athocyate | kliṣṭasya samayasthasya hīnasyottaradīkṣayā || deśāntare vipannasya muktikāmasya deśikaḥ | kauśiṃ tatpratimāṃ kṛtvā paiṣṭiṃ vā gomayodbhavām*. For the edition and annotated translation, see the appendices.

⁷⁵ JR AP 82: *śivadharmā — — — lokadharmānusārataḥ | vidhir eṣa vipannasya sapinḍasyāpi saṃnidhau ||*. For the apparatus and annotated translation, see the appendices.

The first quarter verse has a few syllables missing after the term *śivadharma-* and the translation is therefore uncertain. However, since the text tradition refers to the religious sphere of Śaiva lay devotees as the *śivadharma*, which also features in the name of the root texts for Śaiva lay devotion, the *Śivadharmaśāstra* and *Śivadharmottara*,⁷⁶ it is likely that this is indeed a reference to Śaiva lay devotees. This would also match the term *lo-kadharmānusārataḥ* (“according to the mundane religion”), since such lay Śaivas would follow the brahmanical religion when worshipping Śiva in the *śivaliṅga*. As seen in the table above, parts of this passage, namely 81cd and 82cd–86ab, were incorporated from the NaiKri, but it is noteworthy that this particular half-verse, 81ab, identifying the deceased as a Vaidika and possibly a lay Śaiva, is not found there.

5.1.3 Simple cremation

The simple Śaiva cremation, that is, cremating the corpse with a Śiva fire without initiating the deceased person’s soul, is outlined in a passage incorporated from the BK, where this rite appears to be envisaged as taking place in a monastic context.⁷⁷ Also in the JR, ordinary burning with a Śiva fire is explicitly associated with deceased ascetics or, more precisely, *yogins* who have performed yogic suicide.⁷⁸ Earlier in the work (JR AP 1–5) it is also stated that no post-mortem offerings are to be made for a deceased *yogin*, an instruction that fits the ascetic context.⁷⁹ Nevertheless, also included among those entitled to receive this form of Śaiva cremation is the devout Śaiva householder initiate, with the underlying logic that nothing he

⁷⁶ See the introduction.

⁷⁷ See NGMPP B24/57, ff. 214r1–215r1. See p. 53.

⁷⁸ See JR AP, introduction to verse 83c. For the text and annotated translation, see the appendices.

⁷⁹ JR AP 1–5 seems to be a scriptural passage. As mentioned above, the only reference I have been able to find was the *Ṣaṣṣahasrikā* quoted in the *Dikṣādarśa* for JR AP 2c–3b; however the passage continues differently in these two places. In the JR the next verses briefly enjoin that *yogins* who have died through yogic suicide are merely to be burned with a Śiva fire; those who have died a timely death, received initiation during their lifetime and ardently observed their post-initiatory discipline are also to be burned with a Śiva fire, but receive the rites of *pinḍa* and water offerings to the dead; and finally, those who deviated from post-initiatory discipline are to receive an initiatory cremation.

has done since the time of his initiation can impede the outcome of liberation at death.

5.1.4. Cremation in the case of inauspicious death

The last kind of cremation prescribed in the JR is that for someone who has died an inauspicious death (*durmarāṇa*).⁸⁰ The same section appears verbatim in the *Kriyākramadyotikā* (KKD).⁸¹ Here, the deceased receives a special rite in which the corpse is first burned in silence, whereupon an effigy representing the deceased is made and used for the initiation of his soul. The kind of deaths considered inauspicious include those that have occurred through carelessness, at the hands of a thief, snakebite, fire, elephants, tigers, drowning, in battle, or through suicide.⁸² Curiously, this list appears to include also yogic suicide.⁸³ This seems inappropriate, since in all Śaiva sources mentioning death of this kind, it is associated with accomplished Śaiva *yogins* and promoted as the method to die once one has

⁸⁰ JR AP 117–125. For the text and translation see the appendices.

⁸¹ Note that in both the JR and KKD, the last verse of this passage on procedures after inauspicious death (*durmarāṇa*) mentions the author's name, i.e. Jñānaśiva (here referred to as *śrīśivajñānaśambhu*) and Aghoraśiva (here referred to as *aghoraśambhu*), respectively: JR AP 124: *ity anteṣṭividhiḥ khyātaḥ sarvāvasthāgatātmanām | nānāsiddhāntayuktyaiva śrīśivajñānaśambhunā*; and KKD T 370, p. 210: *ity anteṣṭividhiḥ khyātaḥ sarvāvasthāhatātmanām | nānāsiddhāntayuktyaiva śrīmadāghoraśambhunā* ||. The differences here are quite revealing. In the JR this is the final verse of the *antyeṣṭi* section and thus concludes by saying that Jñānaśiva has described funerary rites for “[the various victims] of death in all sorts of circumstances” (*sarvāvasthāgatātmanām*). In the KKD, on the other hand, more passages on death rites are found after this, the section concluding with funerary rites “for [the various cases] of [people] killed under various circumstances” (*sarvāvasthāhatātmanām*), which refers more closely to the immediately preceding context of inauspicious deaths. Note, however, that the latter variant *sarvāvasthāhatātmanām* is only found in the Mysore manuscript of the JR (see pp. 243, 258 and the bibliography for the manuscript references).

⁸² JR AP 117–118. This is a standard list of circumstances under which the death is considered inauspicious. Cf., for example, *Gāruḍapurāṇa* 2.4.104–2.4.110. Gergely Hidas has pointed out to me that in Buddhism there is a similar list, consisting of death through lions, elephants, fire, snakes, thieves, drowning, captivity and evil spirits. These are collectively referred to as the Eight Great Dangers (cf. Shaw 2006, pp. 318). I would like to thank him for this reference.

⁸³ JR AP 117: *utkrāntyātmaviyuktānām anyeṣām ātmaghātīnām | api dehaṃ dahet pūrvaṃ tūṣṇīm eva śivāgninā*.

achieved “world-weariness” (*nirveda*).⁸⁴ More consonant with this, at two earlier points in the text where such *yogins* are mentioned, it is merely prescribed that they be burnt with a Śiva fire.⁸⁵ Nothing is said about such a death being inauspicious. This appearance of yogic suicide in the list of inauspicious deaths may be due to the JR’s eclectic character; it is not inconceivable that when incorporating passages from different works, various understandings of yogic suicide found their way into the JR. Alternatively, the reading may simply be a corruption and what is intended is, in fact, to distinguish yogic suicide from other forms of suicide, which are considered inappropriate and inauspicious.

5.1.5. A wide range of rituals

From the above, we see that the JR covers many different funeral practices for a wide range of beneficiaries. In order to provide instructions for each case, Jñānaśiva draws from many sources, not only other manuals but also scriptures. His intention to incorporate and standardize these rites prevailed over any desire to avoid doctrinal inconsistencies or overlaps resulting from the eclectic manner of composition.

Further, the manual encompasses cremation-related topics such as a few verses mentioning the gathering of bones (*asthisamcayana*), instructions for periods of death impurity (*śāvāśauca*) and subsequent purification from such impurity, as well as a few regulations concerning the inheritance of a deceased Śaiva’s property.⁸⁶

6. The *Kriyākramadyotikā*

The KKD was composed in 1157/8 by the South Indian Saiddhāntika author Aghoraśiva (also referred to as Aghoraśambhu).⁸⁷ From evidence collected by Goodall and Cox, it appears that he was active in Chidambaram, belonging to the Kauṇḍinya Gotra, and that he was a student of a Hṛdayaśi-

⁸⁴ See Vasudeva 2004, p. 437.

⁸⁵ JR AP 1–2 and the prose passage preceding verse 84.

⁸⁶ For the latter two points, see chapter 4 below.

⁸⁷ Goodall 1998, pp. xiii–xvii, fn. 24.

va.⁸⁸ As mentioned above,⁸⁹ he was a contemporary of Jñānaśiva. Ag-horaśiva's manual received a commentary by Nirmalamāṇi in the sixteenth or seventeenth century, and another by Kacchapeśvara at an unknown date, probably not earlier than that of Nirmalamāṇi.⁹⁰

The manual is written in prose. In some parts it echoes the SP. Breaking up the prose are also four short verse passages in the chapter on cremation that are parallel to the JR.⁹¹ These have been either incorporated from there without attribution, or both manuals have drawn on a common source. As for text that is parallel to scriptural sources, I have been able to identify only one verse, namely SvāSS 22.16. This source is not acknowledged either.⁹² But Aghoraśiva does claim to cite other works, such as the BrP in two places,⁹³ the *Kālottara*,⁹⁴ the *Vātula* (apparently differentiated from the *Kālottara*?), as well as SvāSS.⁹⁵ However, I have thus far been unable to locate these passages in any of the material available to me.⁹⁶

Studying the KKD is currently complicated. There is one published edition from 1927. While it has been made more widely available through a Muktabodha e-text, this e-text does not include the sections on *antyeṣṭi* and *śrāddha*. And although there are several transcripts of manuscripts of the work found on the Muktabodha website,⁹⁷ when compared to one another

⁸⁸ See Goodall 2000, p. 212, fn. 26 and pp. 207–208; and Cox 2006, pp. 93–97.

⁸⁹ See p. 102.

⁹⁰ See Sanderson 2014, p. 25.

⁹¹ JR AP 29–30 = KKD T 370, p. 170; JR AP 91–93 = KKD T 370, p. 213; JR AP 91–93 = KKD T 370, p. 248; JR AP 91–93 = KKD T 370, p. 246.

⁹² KKD T 370, p. 248: *śiṣyaikagurusambandhā gurusambandhinām ca ye | tyajeyus tridinaṃ karma nityād anyaj japādikam ||*.

⁹³ KKD T 370, p. 246, line 3ff and p. 248, line 3ff.

⁹⁴ KKD T 370, p. 167, line 12.

⁹⁵ KKD T 370, p. 217: *svāyambhuve: deśāntare mṛtasyāpi hy antyeṣṭir dīkṣitasya tu | tadā pratikṛtiṃ kṛtvā kartavyā ca kuśair api*.

⁹⁶ It can be noted, however, that the quote in the passage in question, which enjoins the cremation of an effigy for someone who has died abroad, is from a scripture that was later transmitted under the title SvāSS in southern India. While it incorporates parts of the early SvāSS, it is not part of that scripture, examined above in chapter 2. See Goodall 1998, pp. xlviii–li, including fn. 11 on the different versions of the SvāSS.

⁹⁷ There are three transcripts of the text that I am aware of: T 403, T 370 and T 1076, all available on the Muktabodha website: http://muktalib7.org/IFP_ROOT/access_page.htm [last accessed on 16 Sept. 2016]. For reference I use transcript T 370, since it contains a complete account. Transcript T 403 is incomplete, and transcript T 1076, although it seems to contain the entire text, is mixed up in its order. I should also note that the transcripts are

they are different, with significant omissions or additions. A critical edition taking these many manuscripts into account is still a desideratum. While a critical edition of the sections on *antyeṣṭi* and *śrāddha* will be undertaken in the future, for the present discussion, I refer to transcript T 370, as well as, occasionally, T 403.⁹⁸ Despite the lack of a critical edition, however, the transcripts do allow a discussion of the rituals and structures in question. It is important to include them here, since Aghoraśiva's manual contains details about funerary rituals that appear to be specific to the south.

6.1. The three-level cremation model

In the KKD, Aghoraśiva offers a more detailed set of prescriptions for funerary procedures than do his close contemporaries.⁹⁹ For instance, the work offers guidance for parts of the ritual procedure that texts such as the SP hardly mention. There, as noted above, the aim was probably to create a broadly applicable template that allowed local variations to be subsumed in its framework. Aghoraśiva, in contrast, is less hesitant in this respect and his comprehensive account probably reflects local practices. For instance, he discusses procedures that are to take place before the funeral procession, including a so-called *cūrṇotsava*, “powder festival”, specific to the south,¹⁰⁰ as well as those that take place during the gathering of the bones, another ritual sketched only roughly in the other works. Moreover, Aghoraśiva often provides full lists of mantras to be recited at certain moments, something avoided in the other manuals.

In a similar spirit, Aghoraśiva also explains the funerary rites for each initiatory level separately. In other manuals, as shown above, the procedures for the cremation ritual with a funerary initiation are taught as the

slightly different; although they present the same account, they occasionally use different wording (for example, *hrdaya* instead of *hrt*, etc.), wording that, however, does not change the meaning. Unfortunately, I cannot offer a critical edition of the text here; nonetheless I will present preliminary observations concerning the text's contents based on these three transcripts.

⁹⁸ See fn. 97, above.

⁹⁹ For instance, in transcript T 370 of the KKD, the accounts of *antyeṣṭi* and *śrāddha* span more than 85 pages. This is due to the fact that the descriptions of these rituals go into much greater detail than in other works.

¹⁰⁰ KKD T 370, pp. 161–164.

default, mostly preambled by the specification that only those who have received a *nirvāṇadīkṣā* are entitled to receive it. In essence, this teaches that a *samayin* receives the same ritual but without the funerary initiation, but the procedure is never taught separately. Aghoraśiva, in contrast, provides separate sections for each initiatory level, thereby envisaging a tripartite initiation model: a *samayāntyeṣṭi*, that is, the cremation for someone who had received a *samayadīkṣā*; the *viśeṣāntyeṣṭi* for someone who had received the *viśeṣadīkṣā*; and the *nirvāṇāntyeṣṭi* for full initiates.¹⁰¹ All three accounts have the same basic structure; they also share a set of rites at the beginning, instructions that are laid out only once (see section 6.4), before moving on to the descriptions specific to the beneficiary's initiatory status, which are essentially a repetition of the rites that took place during the recipient's initiation during his lifetime. At the end of this procedure, the deceased person's soul is then united with the manifestation of Śiva appropriate to each initiatory level. Hence, in the *samayāntyeṣṭi*, the *ācārya* unites the soul with the Śiva who is the regent of the Rudra-world, the Rudrapada;¹⁰² in the *viśeṣāntyeṣṭi*, with the Śiva who is the regent of the Īśvara-world, the Īśvarapada;¹⁰³ and in the *nirvāṇāntyeṣṭi*, with Śiva in his ultimate, unsurpassed, omniscient and omnipresent nature on the highest level.¹⁰⁴

However, even though these distinctions between the initiatory levels are made clear in the rites, there are some inconsistencies. These may be the result of the author having reworked and expanded on earlier textual material. While in effect Aghoraśiva teaches three different funerary initiations for the three different initiatory levels, the opening of the chapter mentions the simpler view expressed in the other manuals, namely that for *ācāryas*, *sādhakas* and *putrakas*, the cremation is performed with the purification of the path, and for *samayins*, without, echoing the formulations in the SP and JR.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰¹ According to T370.

¹⁰² KKD, T 370, p. 181: *rudrapadādhiṣṭhāyakena śivena saṃyojayet*.

¹⁰³ KKD, T 370, p. 185: *īśvarapadādhiṣṭhāyakena śivena saṃyuktam bhāvayitvā...*

¹⁰⁴ KKD, T 370, p. 212: *śāntyaṭīte dvādaśānte manōṭīte bhāvaśūnye śive saṃyojayet. ta-tra sruvājyāhutibhis tisṛbhiḥ oṃ haum ātman sarvajño bhava svāhā....*

¹⁰⁵ Cf. SP 10.1: *sādhakācāryaputrāṇām mṛtasyaikasya karhi cit | antyeṣṭir ucyate 'nyasya hy adhvaśuddhivivarjitā*, and JR AP 10: *sādhakācāryaputrāṇām kuryād adhvaśo-dhanam | naiva tat samayasthasya kuryād vā mokṣakāṅkṣiṇaḥ*.

Cremation is performed with the purification of the path for *ācāryas*, *sādhakas* and *putrakas*, and without it for *samayins*.¹⁰⁶

The differentiation between the *samayāntyēṣṭi* and the *viśeṣāntyēṣṭi* as we find it in the actual prescriptions is thus missing here. Also the option found in the JR AP 110cd,¹⁰⁷ where in exceptional cases a full initiatory cremation is also performed for a *samayin* who was particularly far along on his spiritual path, is found at the beginning of the KKD's account:

[Cremation] is to be performed together with the purification of the path also for a *samayin* if he was desirous of [undergoing] the liberating initiation ritual, completely devoted in service (*śuśrūṣaṇa*) to his teacher [but] did not receive initiation [during his lifetime].¹⁰⁸

Given the discrepancy between the instructions at the beginning of the chapter, which essentially distinguish between procedures for *putrakas*, etc. and the *samayin* just as in other works, and the extensive prescriptions for a tripartite cremation model that distinguish between *sāmānyasamayins* and *viśeṣasamayins* later in the text, the question arises whether the later differentiation was more of a theoretical endeavour rather than reflecting actual practice. It has already been noted that this tripartite initiation model caused confusion, even amongst Śaiva authors.¹⁰⁹ In this respect we may note that precisely those prescriptions for rites purifying the soul at times retain references to the beneficiary as the disciple (*śiṣya*) rather than as the deceased (*mṛta*), as is usually the case in the funerary context. This, in turn, could be an indication that these passages may simply have been incorporated from the original initiation description without a proper revision.

¹⁰⁶ KKD T 370, p.161: *ācāryasādhakaputrakāṇām antyēṣṭir adhvaśuddhiyutā kartavyā samayinas tadvivarjitā.*

¹⁰⁷ JR AP 10cd: *naiva tat samayasthasya kuryād vā mokṣakāṅkṣiṇaḥ.*

¹⁰⁸ KKD T 370, p.161: *samayino 'pi *nirvānadīkṣārthino* (em.; *nirvānadīkṣārthinā* Cod.) *guruśuśrūṣaṇaparasyāprāptadīkṣasya *mṛtasyādhvaśuddhisahitā* (em.; *mṛtasyādharmaśuddhisahitā* Cod.) *kartavyā.*

¹⁰⁹ See Brunner-Lachaux 1977, pp. 416–418, fn. 457, and p. 19 in the introduction.

6.2. Doctrinal justification

It is striking that the KKD offers nearly no doctrinal justification for performing Śaiva cremation.¹¹⁰ Since – at least theoretically – it links each of the cremation rites with the initiatory status of the deceased, these rites were perhaps simply considered the appropriate last rites for each group. They brought about the level of liberation that the deceased was believed to have achieved as a result of his practice while alive. Only in the *samayāntyeṣṭi* do the instructions suggest that the procedure has an expiatory function. Here, after the guru has united the soul of the deceased with his own and instated the deceased in the appropriate spiritual level, oblations are offered to purify the deceased from any deficits in his conduct.

For a *samayin*, he should then make a hundred oblations with the *mūla-mantra* for the purification of deficiencies in his religious conduct [during his lifetime].¹¹¹

6.3. Range of clientele and ritual agents

The KKD opens its instructions by referring to the deceased initiate as a *śivayogin*. However, the subsequent account is not restricted to deceased ascetics. On the contrary, the first set of procedures involves the *cūrṇotsava*, a rite for preparing the powders and substances to adorn the corpse for the funerary procession; this takes place at the deceased person's house, thus pointing to the householder context. This is further confirmed at the end of the passage, when it is specified that this *cūrṇotsava* is not to be performed for the permanent ascetic. Using the expression *śivayogin* at the beginning thus seems a generic reference to the deceased, perhaps invoking the notion that an initiate is considered to become an ascetic upon death and pointing to the initiate's elevated spiritual status. There are no further in-

¹¹⁰ Note that Nirmalamaṇi, commenting on the KKD, does expound on this issue and insists that Śaiva cremation has an expiatory function. See Brunner-Lachaux 1977, p. 569, 1c and p. 35.

¹¹¹ KKD T 370, p. 118: ...*tataḥ (corr.; tata Cod.) *samayinaṃ (corr.; samayaṃ Cod.) *snātvācāravaikalyasuddhaye mūlānāhutiśataṃ hutvā...*

structions specifying that the procedure is only for ascetics, nor is any reference made to yogic suicide (*utkrānti*).

Throughout the rest of the work, the specifications can apply to either an ascetic or a householder, as in the JR. Nonetheless, most of the instructions do more specifically point to cremation rituals taking place in the householder context. This is explicit, for instance, in the rituals preceding the igniting of the pyre, a significant moment in the cremation ritual that was originally linked to the chief mourner, typically the eldest son. Amongst the early sources on Śaiva *antyeṣṭi*, Aghoraśiva's manual is the only one to explicitly mention the son here:

If the deceased person is a householder, either his son, relative or a disciple, wearing the sacred thread in the inauspicious direction and having purified himself through bathing, should walk around [the pyre] three times in the inauspicious direction carrying the Śiva vase (*śivakumbha*) on his head [and] pouring an uninterrupted stream of water.¹¹²

There are a few other explicit references to the beneficiaries of Śaiva cremation in the KKD. The first concerns *ācāryas*. At two points, the manual adds a specific instruction related to a deceased *ācārya*, namely that for an *ācārya*, the *sruca* and *sruva* sacrificial ladles are to be placed to the left and right of the corpse before the incineration (in other cases, the ladles are simply put on the pyre).¹¹³ What is puzzling is that this ritual detail – the only explicit reference to a change in procedure for an *ācārya* – is not only found in the description of the *nirvāṇāntyeṣṭi*, but also in that of the *samayāntyeṣṭi* (the description of *viśeṣāntyeṣṭi* does not explain the procedure at this point explicitly, but refers back to the *samayāntyeṣṭi*). However, for an *ācārya* only the *nirvāṇāntyeṣṭi* would be appropriate, since the principal requirement for a candidate to be consecrated to the Śaiva office of *ācārya* is that he has undergone *nirvāṇadīkṣā*. Nor can it be the case here, as in

¹¹² KKD T 370, p. 183: ...*mṛte gṛhasthe tatsuto vā jñātī vā śiṣyo vā snātaḥ* (sic) *apasavyopavīt śivakumbhaṃ śirasā vahan apradakṣiṇena *avicchinnaḥ payodhārāṃ* (em.; *avicchinnaḥ payodharāṇ*) *triḥ paribhrāmya*...

¹¹³ KKD T 370, p. 213: *ācāryas cet sruksruvāv adhomukhau vāmadakṣiṇapārśvayoḥ kṣipet*.

other sources, that an *ācārya* and a *samayin* are really to receive the same type of Śaiva cremation, namely, without the initiation of the soul – since according to the prescriptions an *ācārya* would then be guided to the inferior level of Rudra’s world explicitly taught here for this category of cremation. The mention of an *ācārya* in the *samayāntyeṣṭi* is therefore curious and remains unresolved. Had the status of *ācāryas* changed so much that the original major requirement of having received *nirvāṇadīkṣā* was no longer as important? Or was the division into the three kinds of cremation so artificial that *ācāryas* were mistakenly included in the *samayāntyeṣṭi* section in an account that was simply laying out standard funeral rites? Were *ācāryas* still ascetics, as common in the Śaiva Siddhānta, or could they be married priests, for which there is evidence in South India in later periods?¹¹⁴ Was this perhaps why their inclusion was overlooked in an account that seems addressed mainly to the householder community? For now, all of these questions remain open.

Amongst the prescriptions for the *samayāntyeṣṭi*, we find a few clues about the status of *samayins* in the Śaiva community. In the water offerings to the deceased person’s soul after cremation, the spiritual status that the deceased person acquires once he has ascended on his post-mortem path is invoked: during three offerings, three mantras are uttered that anticipate the three future divine manifestations of the deceased person, these being later worshipped during the *śrāddha* rites.¹¹⁵ The divine status reached by the deceased person corresponds to the spiritual status he held when alive, which in turn is based on his initiation level. Thus the invocations for Śaiva initiates, uninitiated lay devotees of Śiva, and Vaidikas are different. But what about the *samayin*? Since a *samayin* is an initiate, he is spiritually superior to a lay devotee. But at the same time he is not at the level of the full initiate who has received the *nirvāṇadīkṣā*. No other early sources give explicit instructions about which spiritual levels are to be invoked for a *samayin* at the time of the water offerings. But the KKD specifies that the divine invocations to be used for *samayins* are the same as for lay devotees,

¹¹⁴ Fuller 1984, pp. 30–32 and 59–62.

¹¹⁵ See chapter 5, below.

namely Skanda, Caṇḍa, and Gaṇādhīśa (i.e. Gaṇeśvara).¹¹⁶ This demonstrates that the boundary between uninitiated lay devotees and lower grade initiates was fluid. In fact, later South Indian sources often confuse these two categories, as does contemporary secondary literature.¹¹⁷ It seems probable that as a result of these two groups becoming increasingly integrated over the course of time in South India, the awareness of the differentiation was lost.

6.4. Particulars of procedure before and after those specific to the initiatory level

The three types of regular cremation are described as sharing the same rites up to the fusion of the vital channels (*nāḍīsaṃdhāna*). These are the following: the funeral procession (T 370, p. 164); the preparation of the cremation site including the platform for the deceased, the fire pit and the pit for the pyre (T 370, p. 164); the preparatory rites of the guru himself and the substances to be used during the ritual (T 370, pp. 154–167); the ritual preparation of the pit for the pyre, including the drawing of maṇḍalas and invoking the various site guardians (T 370, pp. 167–173); generating Śiva fire (*śivāgni*) (T 370, p. 173); piling the pyre (T 370, p. 173–180); preparing the corpse by bathing and purificatory rites, as well as emplacing the

¹¹⁶ For the passage in the *samayāntyeṣṭi*, see KKD T 370, p. 183–184 (the names of the deities are marked in bold): *jalāśayaṃ gatvā snātvā tīrabhūmau kuśān āstīrya. oṃ hāṃ śudhātman skando bhava svadhā, oṃ hāṃ caṇḍo bhava svadhā, oṃ hāṃ śuddhātman gaṇādhīśo bhava svadhā. iti trīn nivāpāñjalīn dadyāt*. For the corresponding section of the *viśeṣāntyeṣṭi*, note that T 370 omits the rites that are to take place after the purification of the soul according to initiatory status, probably because these rites are the same as in the *samayāntyeṣṭi*. However, another transcript, T 403, does add this passage after the *viśeṣāntyeṣṭi*, in fact it replicates the text from the *samayāntyeṣṭi* precisely and thus, also the same invocations for the water offerings after the cremation. Compare these to the invocations after the *nirvāṇāntyeṣṭi*, the deceased being given consecutively the spiritual status of the highest manifestations of Śiva, namely Īśa, Sadāśiva and Śānta; KKD T 370, p. 213: *jalāśayaṃ *gatvā* (em.; *natvā* Cod) *snātvā tīrabhūmau kuśān āstīrya trīn nivāpāñjalīn oṃ hāṃ śuddhātman īśo bhava svadhā. evaṃ sadāśivo bhava śūnto bhava iti datvā*. See also chapter 5.

¹¹⁷ For example, Brunner-Lachaix (1977, p. 630, fn. 21), in her annotations to the *śrādhā* chapter of the SP, understands the term *rudrāṃśa*, in accordance with later South Indian sources, to refer to those initiates who had only undergone *samayadīkṣā*. But Sanderson has shown that this term was originally used to refer to the Rudrabhaktas, the worshippers of Rudra, that is, uninitiated lay worshippers of the *śivaliṅga* (Sanderson 2003/2004, pp. 354–355, fn. 16). In later South Indian sources, this differentiation is no longer found.

soul and the *vidyādeha* (T 370, p. 180); and uniting the deceased person's soul with the central channel (*nāḍīsamdhāna*) (T 370, p. 180). This moment signals the beginning of the rites specific to the individual soul, which are essentially the repetition of the rites performed during the initiation rites proper, as was discussed above in 6.1.

Ritual procedures that are not discussed in other sources but form a substantial part of the instructions in the KKD are those that take place at the deceased person's house before the funeral procession. The KKD teaches that the deceased person's corpse is to be bathed and adorned with flowers, perfume and new clothes. A rite specific to the KKD, as mentioned above, is the *cūrṇotsava* (powder festival). Here, an area close to the house is prepared with purificatory substances, where a lotus maṇḍala is traced out with coloured powder, corn and grains of rice. This is adorned with a wooden mortar and pestle and is worshipped, followed by the installation and worship of ritual vases. A drum is also worshipped and music played on it, accompanied with song and dance.¹¹⁸ The *cūrṇotsava* appears to be a feature specific to South India, since aside from here it is only found in later South Indian sources such as the *Rauravāgama*, the *Cintyāgama* and the *Kāmikāgama*. There, such a *cūrṇotsava* is also described in relation to the production of the powder used for smearing cult images.¹¹⁹ And in the *Dīkṣādarśa*, preserved in South-Indian manuscripts, the context of cremation rituals is also specifically mentioned, with a *cūrṇotsava* to be performed on the occasion of an initiate dying and at the time of the departure of the deities at the end of certain kinds of worship.¹²⁰ It thus seems that the KKD is incorporating some local rituals here.

Aghoraśiva's injunctions for the lighting of the pyre and the concluding rites are all similar to those in the other sources. After the incineration of the corpse, the officiant is to circle the pyre with a vase from which he pours water over his shoulder. He is then to smash it on the floor, proceed to a body of water such as a river, and perform the water offerings to the

¹¹⁸ Cf. KKD T 370, pp. 161–164.

¹¹⁹ See *s.v. cūrṇotsavavidhi* in TAK 3.

¹²⁰ *Dīkṣādarśa*, T 372, p. 1626: *mṛtasya dīkṣitasyāpi cūrṇotsavaṃ ca kārayet | devānām utsavānte tu viśarjam idaṃ bhavet*. This quotation by Vedajñāna is attributed to the *Rauravāgama*, but it is not found in the manuscripts used by Bhatt in his edition.

deceased there. As mentioned, during these water offerings, the ancestral identities that the deceased soul will eventually assume are evoked.¹²¹

The KKD also instructs that the bones are to be collected on the first, second, third or fourth day after the cremation.¹²² These instructions are similar to those in the SP and JR. However, the KKD is the only text to provide a few details about the rites to be performed before the bones are collected. The officiant is to produce a fire next to the pyre and offer a hundred oblations for expiation into it while reciting the weapon mantra. Then he is to offer three oblations to each of the *tattvas*, starting with the earth, while pronouncing the mantras addressed to them ending with *namaḥ*. This is followed by worshipping them with another set of three oblations each, this time the mantras ending in *svāhā*.¹²³ Finally, the fire is to be extinguished and the bones collected while reciting respectively the five *brahmanamantras*, starting with *sadyojāta*, while collecting the bones believed to be those of the feet, the genital area, the heart, mouth and the head. After this, the remains are disposed of in the same manner found in the other sources, namely in a pot filled with milk that is placed either on a sacred site or thrown into a sacred body of water.¹²⁴

After discussing the rites related to cremation, the manual continues with injunctions for the rituals that are to be performed during the days after the cremation (the *pāṣaṇasthāpanavidhi* and the *rudrabali*) and for the various kinds of *śrāddhas* that follow – the *ekoddiṣṭaśrāddha*, the *sapiṇḍikaraṇa* and the *pārvaṇaśrāddha*. These will be discussed in chapter 5. However, it is not certain if all of these sections were originally part of Aghoraśiva's text.

¹²¹ See p. 113.

¹²² KKD T 370, pp. 230–232.

¹²³ See KKD T 370, pp. 231–232 (in this transcript, the passage is preceded by text that has no parallel in T 403): **cītāsamiṭe* (em.; *śucitāsamiṭe* Cod.) *śivāgnim utpāḍya prāyaścīt-tārtham astreṇa śataṃ hutvā, pṛthivyāditattvānām pūjāpurassaraṃ prayekam āhutiṭrayaṃ dadyāt*. After this, each of the *tattvas* is addressed with the formula '*oṃ hāṃ X-tattvāya namaḥ*' and '*oṃ hāṃ X-tattvāya svāhā*'. The order of *tattvas* is as follows: Pṛthivī, Āpas, Tejas, Vāyu, Ākāśa, Gandha, Rasa, Rūpa, Sparśa, Śabda, Upastha, Pāyu, Pāda, Pāṇi, Vāk, Nāsā, Jihvā, Cakṣus, Tvak, Śrotra, Manas, Ahaṃkāra, Buddhi, Guṇa, Prakṛti, Puruṣa, Rāga, Vidyā, Kalā, Niyati, Kāla, Māyā, Śuddhavidyā, Īśvara, Sadāśiva, Śakti and Śiva.

¹²⁴ See KKD T 370, p. 232: *agnim viṣṭjya tataḥ pādaguhyahṛdayamukhaśirosthīni sadyādimantrair uddhṛtya trikāṣṭhikopariṣṭhitakarkarīpayasi kṣipet. tatas tu śuddhau dese sthāpayet, yadvā, samudrādītīrthe jale kṣipet...*

6.5. Special cremation rites

The instructions for regular cremation rituals, those to be performed when a person has died under circumstances considered regular and not inauspicious, are followed by special versions of cremation, namely (1) the *mṛtakadīkṣā*; (2) a section on *durmarāṇa* (deaths under inauspicious circumstances); and (3) the *yugapatkrame kalāśuddhiyutāntyeṣṭi* (cremation with the simultaneous purification of all *kalās*, i.e. the units into which the entire universe is divided). The first of these, the *mṛtakadīkṣā*, is to be performed if the corpse is not available because the person has died somewhere far away.¹²⁵ Similar to the accounts we have already seen for this kind of ritual, here an effigy is created that represents the deceased person. This is used for the soul's initiation and the final cremation. Before the initiation, all of the *tattvas* are installed in the effigy, together with the governing deities.¹²⁶ The sequence of *tattvas* here is nearly the same as that in the chapter on the *mṛtakadīkṣā* in the SJU suggesting that Aghoraśiva used this as his source for this rite. The section on *durmarāṇa*,¹²⁷ as mentioned above, exactly parallels that of the JR.¹²⁸ The last kind of special cremation is the *yugapatkrame kalāśuddhiyutāntyeṣṭi*. This seems simply to be an additional option for an initiatory cremation. How or why it is to be applied is not specified in the text.¹²⁹ I have not found any sources with parallel passages that might clarify its precise function.

¹²⁵ KKD T 370, pp. 214–217.

¹²⁶ Note that even during the standard funerary account of how to prepare the corpse, the KKD indicates that in case of a *mṛtakadīkṣā*, the *tattvas* are to be placed in a puppet instead; KKD T 370, p. 180, l. 6: *atrāvasare kuśādinirmitadehaś ced mṛtakadīkṣāṃ sādhipaṣaṭṭriṃśat-tattvanyāsādīkām kuryāt.*

¹²⁷ KKD T 370, pp. 217–219.

¹²⁸ See p. 103.

¹²⁹ KKD T 370, pp. 219–225.

